

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 remain pending in this application for which applicants seek reconsideration.

Amendment

The specification has been amended to change the language "download through a network" to --network storage-- to overcome the § 101 rejection. Claims 6 and 9 have been amended to correct typographical errors, namely correcting "the the" in claim 6 and correcting pendency "6" to --7-- in claim 9, as suggested by the examiner, to overcome the § 112 rejection. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1, 2, and 4-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Saito (USP 6,480,884) in view of Billmers (USP 6,226,630). Claim 3 was rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Saito in view of Billmers and Shiota (USP 6,683,700). Applicants traverse these rejections because none of the applied references would have taught creating a file name based on the "SUBJECT FIELD," in contrast to the examiner's assertion.

Applicants previously argued that none of the previously applied references would have disclosed or taught generating a file name of an email attachment based on the subject header of an email. The examiner acknowledges that Saito fails to disclose this aspect of the invention. In this respect, the examiner now relies on Billmers for the proposition that generating the name of an email attachment based on the subject header of an email would have been obvious, relying on the passage set forth in column 6, lines 48-63.

Billmers discloses a way of organizing email messages into folders. In contrast to the examiner's assertion, Billmers does not disclose creating a file name based on the "SUBJECT FIELD." Indeed, Billmers merely calls for creating an email message with a SUBJECT FIELD:URGENT based on the message containing the word "urgent."

At step 110, the query GUI combines the Preliminary Query 108 with any previously existing query files associated with the same output folder. For example, if an existing folder named "urgent" had previously been defined to include all messages having the word "urgent" in the subject subfield of a message, and a Rule 104 specified that if a message was received having the word "urgent" in its body then to include the message in the "urgent" folder, at step 110, a compound search query would be formed which would return all messages having the word "urgent" in either the body or subject field of the message. For example, step 120 would output a

compound query 112 of SUBJECT<sub>13</sub> FIELD:URGENT OR BODY:URGENT, which would then be stored in the folder having the folder name "urgent". In the example query syntax, a keyword to the left of a colon indicates a subfield within a received message, which the information to the right of the colon is a searchable string or other content. [Column 6, lines 1-18].

Now with reference to FIG. 5, there is described an example embodiment of steps performed by the Query GUI 70 in FIG. 2 to generate an alert query, such as Alert Queries 92. At step 140, the Query GUI 70 displays a form or template to the user, for example, in IF (condition)/THEN (action) format. The user indicates, for example, that upon receipt of a message having the word "urgent" in the subject field of an e-mail message the system should alert the user by creating a notification pop-up window. As a result, a corresponding Rule 142 is formed into an alert query at step 144. The alert query, for example, is SUBJECT<sub>13</sub> FIELD:URGENT, and is stored, for example, in a file named Alert Query 1, corresponding to Alert Query AQ1 in FIG. 2. The disclosed system is further capable of processing and storing compound alert queries similarly as in steps 106 through 112 in FIG. 3. [Column 6, lines 48-63].

Billmers simply does not disclose generating a name of an email attachment based on the subject header of an email. Billmers at best would mere have taught storing the query as a file according to the word in the subject field, and would not have disclosed or taught establishing a relationship between the subject of the received email message a file name of a file attached to the email. Note that Billmers does not disclose or teach naming the file attachment based on the SUBJECT FIELD since Billmers names the generated urgent messages as "Alert Query X," which has nothing to do with the subject of the message. Moreover, the query is not a file attached to the email message. Accordingly, applicants submit that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the applied references.

In short, Saito discloses a way of transmitting an email, whereas Billmers discloses a way of receiving and organizing email. Accordingly, applicants also submit that the combination urged by the examiner would not have been tenable. Shiota would not have alleviated the shortcomings of Saito or Billmers.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-9 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicants urge the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

05 SEPTEMBER 2006

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)